

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5036	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Regional Water Authority	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$500,000
PROJECT TITLE	Regional Water Authority Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Program	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$1,419,224

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop an IRWMP that meets the collective water resource planning needs and objectives of the greater Sacramento region by completing the prioritization of management issues and projects; developing a Water Accounting Framework; updating and refining the IGSM groundwater model of the North American Groundwater Basin to allow adequate measurement, determination, and forecasting of effects of future expanded conjunctive management operations; and completing and adopting the IRWMP.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 12

Comment: The work plan, schedule, and budget in the proposal are well developed and sufficiently detailed; however, supporting documentation for the budget estimate and its assumption on labor hours were lacking. Task 6 (Refinements of the existing IGSM model) is contingent upon getting funds from USACE and DWR LGA grant funding. It is also unclear if the proposal intends to use the requested grant funds as a substitution to existing USACE funding for Task 5 (Initial development of the IGSM model) and what portions would be eligible as local agency share for continued work.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The region is described as encompassing all of Sacramento County plus the eastern watersheds, which are in El Dorado and Placer Counties. The description of the region was detailed, including the significance of water quality and quantity, related water infrastructure, political and water purveyor boundaries, biological and ecological significance, environmental concerns, and economical conditions and trends. However, it did not discuss land-use issues and important cultural or social values within the region. The proposal will not encompass the defined region and the lack of participation of the southern Sacramento County agencies and community stakeholders is disconcerting since they represent a significant increase in future demand. A parallel study is reportedly being conducted for the southern portion of the region and this region overlaps with PIN 5224. The proposal didn't adequately explain why the region needs to be segmented.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The proposed objectives are adequately described and detailed and its relationship to statewide priorities defined. However, since the proposal does not address portions of the region, it is uncertain how the proposal can meet its stated regional objectives. Ecological concerns are lacking and it is heavily biased towards water supply issues. The proposal didn't have any emphasis on the habitat restoration elements outside of the benefits related to water banking activity.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The proposal identified various water management strategies that will be analyzed, but does not provide details or a technical process on how they are to be integrated. The development of the integration strategy is a work scope task. The proposal did not demonstrate that integration of the various water management strategies will produce a synergistic effect; however, it has shown an ability to garner institutional agreements with its member agencies as demonstrated by the applicant's participation in EWA and establishing sustainable yield for the groundwater basin. Aside from citation of past success with water banking for the environment, the strategies seem to be short on identification of other strategies for habitat restoration.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant has an established institutional structure to ensure IRWMP implementation; however, the applicant does not identify how it will be implemented beyond adoption of the IRWMP. In addition, the proposal does not have a mechanism or process for monitoring the performance or means to modify the IRWMP. The applicant does not indicate how the IRWMP will be integrated with other planning efforts. The description of the IRWMP as a living document is assuring; especially given the lack of participation in southern Sacramento County.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The proposal does not have the analytical framework to evaluate the potential impacts and benefits within the region and adjacent areas. The establishment of this framework is identified as a work item. Compliance with CEQA is a proposed work item and is inadequately addressed.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: Although the proposal cites numerous sources of data, it does not provide an analysis if the existing data will adequately support the proposed planning. Evaluation of the data is identified as a work item. The results of the data collection, along with completion of the IGSM model, should provide a detailed technical analysis of the area within northern Sacramento County, but will not include the data needs for the entire IRWMP region. The proposal included a thorough description of the data needs and how it will support the planning effort in the modeling boundaries. The background studies supporting the modeling and planning is especially well described.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The proposal has a well documented data management strategy and data dissemination plan. All aspects of data management are covered adequately. The proposal also demonstrated how the data management will support statewide data needs. Data collected will be reported to the SWRCB, DWR, interested parties, and other IRWMP participants.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal has a well defined stakeholder involvement and implementation discussion in the IRWMP and shows appropriate measures to identify and include additional stakeholders. Environmental justice concerns will be addressed as part of compliance with CEQA/NEPA, and any local, State, and federal requirements, its member agencies, consultants, and the USACE. The stakeholder list could have included more local watershed and environmental members. The process for involvement and implementation does not discuss committees or project support for locally sponsored restoration and preservation activity.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant does not indicate any special financial consideration for DACs although existence of such communities within the region is noted. The majority of the communities identified as disadvantaged are located outside of the region. The proposal does not indicate if DAC representative will be included in the planning, nor if and how DACs will benefit. Direct benefits cited are improved water reliability, water quality, and environmental benefits as result of the IRWMP, however applicant does not demonstrate why and how the IRWMP will provide additional benefits to DACs. The proposal requests for consideration are based on generalities and no specifics were given that demonstrate the needs. The applicant notes that the groundwater and supply reliability benefits will accrue to all residents of the region.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal has a detailed account of local planning documents that will form the basis of the applicant's IRWMP, which will then form the basis of the IRWMP for the entire region. Water management strategy and dynamics between local and regional levels of planning could not be fully evaluated since the proposal will only serve portions of the region.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The applicant was formed under a JPA with well established coordination between its member agencies and other local, State, and federal agencies. It will also utilize, coordinate, and form cooperating relationship with local land-use planning authorities using Sacramento Area Counsel of Governments as a venue.

TOTAL SCORE: 69